A

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/755,635	01/05/2001	Robert E. Dvorak	BLFR 1001-1	4822

22470 7590 04/27/2007

HAYNES BEFFEL & WOLFELD LLP
P O BOX 366
HALF MOON BAY, CA 94019

EXAMINER	
VAN DOREN, BETH	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
3623	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/27/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/755,635	DVORAK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Beth Van Doren	3623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *08 February 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *26-35,37,40-46 and 93* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *26-35,37,40-46 and 93* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 02/08/07 has been entered.

2. Claim 93 has been added. Claims 25, 36, and 38-39 have been canceled. Claims 26-35, 37, 40-46 have been amended. Claims 26-35, 37, 40-46, and 93 are pending.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 93 is objected to because of the following informalities: parenthetical references to the specification in the claim limitations. Theses references are not appropriate in the claim language. Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 41-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 41 recites "including selecting among a plurality of available approaches to calculating the presentation quantity" and "selecting the presentation quantity used to be the

average presentation quantity for the location during the predetermined selling period". It is not clear if these two limitations are related or if they independently limit the claimed invention. Specifically, the second part of claim 41 recites selecting a quantity, whereas the first part recites selecting an approach to calculate a quantity. It is not clear how if the quantity is calculated by a selected approach, how the quantity is also selected. Therefore, for examination purposes, it is assumed that these are separate steps. Clarification is required.

Claims 42-44 recite similar claim language to claim 41 and therefore have the same deficiencies. Clarification is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 25-46 and 93 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Landvater (U.S. 6,609,101) in view of Display Unlimited (www.displayunlimited.com).

As per claim 93, Landvater teaches a computer implemented method of simulating demand for and stocking of standard presentation fixture types used in retail outlets having differing floor plans, including:

for use across selling locations, designating a plurality of display fixture setups, the display fixture setups including a display fixture and a capacity for holding items and independently storing instances of the display fixture setups to differentiate among the instances at a particular selling location (See figures 14 and 15, column 1, lines 40-50, column 2, lines 20-

27, column 14, lines 25-65, column 15, lines 1-6 and 17-25, wherein profiles of display setups are stored in the system, the stored information including a display fixture and capacity (i.e. shelf with specific space), wherein each instance of a display configuration is stored in the database for planning purposes);

for the selling locations, recording in data structures the instances of display fixture setups that are present at the selling locations (See column 14, lines 25-45, wherein display configurations are stored in the database);

for items to be displayed, recording presentation dates during which the items are to be displayed in the named instances and presentation quantities (See figures 14 and 15, column 1, lines 40-50, column 2, lines 20-27, column 14, lines 25-65, column 15, lines 1-6 and 17-25, wherein the good has a time of display and quantities to be displayed);

for use across selling locations, recording in data structures time elements that are used collectively to represent the lead time for an order or other action to lead to display of the items at the selling locations (See column 8, lines 25-40, column 9, lines 15-25 and 55-column 10, line 20, column 14, lines 25-45 and line 64-column 15, line 6 and 17-25, wherein time information associated with the display is stored in the system database, as well as time-phased forecasts and actions, and lead times);

for the items at the selling locations, selecting a plurality of the time elements to represent the lead time (See column 8, lines 25-40, column 9, lines 15-25, column 17, line 60-column 18, line 2, which discloses lead time);

simulating sales of the items at the locations during a predetermined selling period and the orders that would need to be placed to stock the display fixture setups and to satisfy the

simulated sales, using the selected time elements for the lead time and the presentation dates and the presentation quantities (See column 8, lines 19-35, column 9, lines 50-62, column 10, lines 1-2 and 30-55, column 12, lines 10-30 and 40-55, wherein sales are forecasted and modeled for a selling period to determine inventory and safety stock considerations, as well as replenishments, based on the expected sales. See also column 14, line 59-column 15, line 25,);

reporting results of the simulating (See column 8, lines 25-40).

However, while Landvater discloses a number of shelf configurations, shelves versus floor displays, and storing information concerning the shelves and displays in the system, Landvater does not expressly disclose specific display fixture types or named display fixture types present at locations.

Display Unlimited discloses different display fixture types and using these fixture types to design layouts of stores in retail environments (See pages 2-3, page 4, section 1, and page 5, section 1, which discloses fixture types and layouts of stores with multiple elements).

Landvater discloses alternative treatments of presentation demand (i.e. different shelf configurations) as well as different types of display (shelves and floor models). Landvater stores information concerning these presentations and displays in the system. Examiner points out that different fixtures types and the scheduling of different fixture types for store resets and remodels are well-known in the retail industry. Further, Landvater states that the shelf/display configurations are stored in the database in a way that shelf-planning systems can be easily interfaced with aspects of the system. See column 14, lines 34-40. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include data representing the fixture types of Display Unlimited in the data already stored by Landvater

concerning displays and shelves in order to more accurately calculate the stock replenishments needed to maintain attractive displays by ensuring the capacity of the fixtures is accounted for. See column 14, lines 25-35 and 55-65 of Landvater.

As per claim 26, Landvater discloses designating whether or not a quantity of an item at the selling location should be allowed to fall below the presentation quantity between deliveries (See column 14, lines 25-65, column 15, lines 1-6 and 17-25, wherein a number is set for replenishment purposes so that an attractive display can be maintained).

As per claim 27, Landvater discloses wherein the time elements include delivery of the item from a stocking location (See figure 1, column 6, lines 45-67, column 8, lines 25-45, column 9, lines 1-25 and 55-67, column 13, lines 30-45 and 59-67, column 14, lines 25-65, which discloses a stocking location).

As per claim 28, Landvater teaches wherein the time elements include preparing the delivered item for sale (See column 3, lines 10-30, column 8, lines 25-45, column 9, lines 1-25 and 55-67,column 14, lines 25-65, which discloses setting up the display of the delivered good).

As per claim 29, Landvater disclosed wherein the time elements include time required to collect data, review action recommendations, process data, pick goods at a stocking location, and ship the item to the selling location (See column 3, lines 10-30, column 7, lines 1-25, column 8, lines 25-45, column 9, lines 1-25 and 55-67, column 14, lines 25-65, column 16, lines 35-65).

As per claim 30, Landvater wherein the time element further include periodic dates for actions necessary to make the item available at the plurality of selling locations (See figures 8 and 9, column 4, lines 20-40 and 54-66, column 10, column 11, lines 15-35, wherein time periods for forecasting are set in the system).

As per claim 31, Landvater discloses wherein the time elements include time of distributing the good from one or more first level stocking locations to a plurality of second level stocking locations (See figure 1, column 3, lines10-30, column 6, lines 45-67, column 7, lines 1-25, column 8, lines 25-45, column 9, lines 1-25 and 55-67, wherein the good is distributed among level 2 and 3 stocking locations using a time element).

As per claim 32, Landvater wherein the time elements include time for distributing the item from one or more first level stocking locations to a plurality of second level stocking locations (See figure 1, column 3, lines 10-30, column 6, lines 45-67, column 7, lines 1-25, column 8, lines 25-45, column 9, lines 1-25 and 55-67, wherein the good is distributed among level 2 and 3 stocking locations using a time element).

As per claim 33, Landvater teaches wherein the time elements include time for distributing the item from a supplier through one or more stocking locations to a plurality of selling locations (See figure 1, column 3, lines10-30, column 6, lines 45-67, column 7, lines 1-25, column 8, lines 25-45, column 9, lines 1-25 and 55-67, wherein the good is distributed from a supplier to the selling location using a time element).

As per claim 34, Landvater discloses wherein the time elements include time for distributing the item from a supplier through one or more stocking locations to a plurality of selling locations (See figure 1, column 3, lines10-30, column 6, lines 45-67, column 7, lines 1-25, column 8, lines 25-45, column 9, lines 1-25 and 55-67, column 14, lines 25-65, wherein the good is distributed from a supplier to the selling location using a time element).

As per claim 35, Landvater discloses wherein the action includes distribution of the item from one or more stocking locations to a plurality of selling locations (See figure 1, column 6,

lines 45-67, column 7, lines 1-25column 8, lines 25-45, column 9, lines 1-25, column 13, lines 30-45 and 59-67, column 14, lines 25-65, wherein the good is distributed from a stocking location to selling locations).

As per claim 37, Landvater teaches wherein the action includes allocating delivery of the item after ordering from a supplier (See figure 1, column 6, lines 45-67, column 8, lines 25-45, column 9, lines 1-25 and 55-67, column 13, lines 30-45 and 59-67, column 14, lines 25-65, wherein deliveries of goods from suppliers are allocated).

As per claim 40, Landvater teaches wherein simulating includes adding the presentation quantities and the projected demand requirements for the item at the selling locations (See column 8, lines 25-45, column 9, lines 1-25 and 55-67, column 10, lines 1-20, column 14, lines 25-65, column 15, lines 1-6 and 17-25, which discuss presentation quantities and demand requirements).

As per claims 41-44, Landvater teaches selecting the presentation quantity to be the average presentation quantity for the location during the predetermined selling period (See column 8, lines 25-45, column 9, lines 1-25 and 55-67, column 10, lines 1-20, column 14, lines 25-65, column 15, lines 1-6 and 17-25, which discuss presentation quantities).

As per claims 42-44, Landvater teaches *selecting the* presentation quantity used to be:

the presentation quantity for the selling location on the first day of the predetermined selling period (See column 8, lines 25-45, column 9, lines 1-25 and 55-67, column 10, lines 1-20, column 14, lines 25-65, column 15, lines 1-6 and 17-25, which discuss presentation quantities).

the presentation quantity on the day of the predetermined selling period when the good is received at the selling location (See column 8, lines 25-45, column 9, lines 1-25 and 55-67,

column 10, lines 1-20, column 14, lines 25-65, column 15, lines 1-6 and 17-25, which discuss presentation quantities).

the largest presentation quantity associated with the item at the selling location for any day of the predetermined selling period (See column 8, lines 25-45, column 9, lines 1-25 and 55-67, column 10, lines 1-20, column 14, lines 25-65, column 15, lines 1-6 and 17-25, which discuss presentation quantities at the maximum and minimum acceptable levels).

However, neither Landvater nor Display Unlimited expressly discloses selecting among a plurality of available approaches to calculating the presentation quantity.

Landvater discloses selecting a presentation quantity being selected in the system, the presentation quantity selected representing different values. Landvater further discloses calculating demand needs based on the presentation plan. It is old and well known in the art to provide user's with menus of choices from which the user can select a choice to be implemented by the software. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a menu for choosing an approach to select the type of presentation quantity value to use in order to more accurately calculate the stock replenishments needed to maintain attractive displays by ensuring the capacity of the fixtures is accounted for. See column 14, lines 25-35 and 55-65 of Landvater.

As per claim 45, Landvater teaches wherein the simulating includes selecting the larger of the presentation quantities or the projected demand requirements for the item at the selling locations (See column 8, lines 25-45, column 9, lines 1-25 and 55-67, column 10, lines 20-50, column 14, lines 25-65, column 15, lines 1-6 and 17-25, which discuss presentation quantities at the maximum and minimum acceptable levels).

As per claim 46, Landvater teaches wherein the presentation quantity used is the presentation quantity for the selling location on the last day of the predetermined selling period (See column 8, lines 25-45, column 9, lines 1-25 and 55-67, column 10, lines 1-20, column 14, lines 25-65, column 15, lines 1-6 and 17-25, which discuss presentation quantities at the maximum and minimum acceptable levels).

Response to Arguments

8. Examiner notes Applicant's comments concerning *McLaughlin* on pages 17-18 of the remarks.

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to Landvater (U.S. 6,609,101) in view of Display Unlimited (www.displayunlimited.com) have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive. In the remarks applicant argues that (1) Landvater does not teach or suggest a named display setup or associating items with a display, (2) that Display Unlimited does not teach designing an inventory program, (3) Landvater does not hint that inaccuracies would result and thus does not provide the motivation of improving accuracy and further there is no motivation to combine the secondary reference with the primary reference of Landvater, (4) Landvater does not teach or suggest building a lead time for an item at a selling location from the time elements, as per claims 29-30, 32, and 34, (5) allocating delivery of the item after ordering as per claim 37, (6) Landvater teaches one approach to calculating presentation quantities, not the six required by claims 41-46.

In response to argument (1), Examiner respectfully disagrees. Examiner explicitly stated that Landvater does not expressly disclose specific display fixture types and numbers of the named display fixture types present at locations. Landvater does disclose a computer based

system that stores information about shelves and the setup of these shelves, as well as floor displays (even if the display is one bed), to track in the system the need for product reorders. Therefore, the shelf configurations (ie number of facings and number of shelves) are used to determine the amount of stock needed to fill the display by the system. Therefore, the "shelf configurations" of Landvater stored by the system and the "display fixture types" of the currently recited claims serve the same purpose – to determine demand requirements for goods at specific times.

As to associating items with a display, examiner points out that Landvater discloses the ability to store displays with different number of facings and shelves, where facings and shelves are parts and/or elements. Landvater specifically uses the language "configuration" in column 14, lines 25-35. Further, the system of Landvater is capable of recognizing floor displays and shelves for demand related purposes. Whether it is one bed or 50 sitting on the floor of the store, the system still considers the demand for products to support such displays and in the same manner. The system is aware of what products are scheduled to be displayed in the shelf configurations and floor displays. See column 14, line 20-column 15, line 15.

In response to argument (2), Examiner point out that Display Unlimited was relied upon to teach different display fixture types and using these fixture types to design layouts of stores in retail environments (See pages 2-3, page 4, section 1, and page 5, section 1, which discloses fixture types and layouts of stores with multiple elements). Thus, Display Unlimited was not relied on to teach designing an inventory program. As to applicant's mention of the secondary reference being a furniture advertisement, Examiner respectfully disagrees. Display Unlimited discloses a consulting service that aids a retailer in designing and arranging displays and fixture

types at his/her sales location. Thus, this teaching is specifically relevant, since the system of Landvater is capable of storing displays in memory and Display Unlimited discloses more types of displays that were being used by retail stores at the time of the invention. Landvater specifically states that the shelf/display configurations are stored in the database of the system in a way that shelf-planning systems can be easily interfaced with aspects of the system. See column 14, lines 34-40. Thus the display types of Display Unlimited would be able to be stored in the system of Landvater to accomplish the same end result – establishing demand for products and product stocks needed to support the display. The system of Landvater is mainly concerned with the product needs of the display.

In response to argument (3) that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971). Examiner notes Applicant's comments concerning *McLaughlin* on pages 17-18 of the remarks.

Landvater suggests the combination of Landvater and Display Unlimited. See column 14, lines 25-65, which discloses the display planning portion interfacing with other areas of the system. Further, Landvater discusses here shelf planning systems. Therefore, the combination of Landvater with Display Unlimited, a consulting service that discloses arranging displays and fixture types at his/her sales location is within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed

invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure. Rather, Landvater leads to the use of shelf planning systems.

In response to argument (4), Examiner respectfully disagrees. For clarification purposes, examiner has included a discussion of each of these claims. Landvater specifically addresses these limitations as follows. First, Landvater expressly teaches a time-phased planning system using in a retail store supply chain with one or more retail stores (first level), one or more suppliers (second level) and one or more manufacturers. See specifically figure 1 and column 6, lines 45-67. Landvater specifically teaches associating time elements in the time-phased planning system with a good at a plurality of selling locations (See also column 9, lines 15-25 and 55-67, column 14, line 60-column 15, line 6). The time elements of the time-phased planning system include time to collect data, review action recommendations, process data, pick goods, and ship goods to the selling location (See column 3, lines 10-30, column 8, lines 25-45, column 9, lines 1-25, column 14, lines 60-67, column 16, lines 35-65, wherein data is collected in a database and processed to determine supply needs. The goods are picked to be shipped based on the goods on hand and the forecasted need for the product. The timing of the shipment is based on the lead time needed by the retailer and thus time elements concerning transit time and lead time are considered when ordering supply. Exceptions are reviewed, such as when exception messages are generated). The elements include periodic dates for actions necessary to make the good available at the plurality of selling locations (the plurality of selling locations are addressed above. Further, figures 8 and 9, column 4, lines 54-66, column 10, column 11, lines 15-35, which discuss weekly, monthly, yearly forecasting). The elements also include time to distribute the good from stocking locations to second level stocking locations and finally the time

to distribute the good from a supplier through a stocking location to a plurality of selling locations (See column 7, lines 1-25, column 8, lines 25-45, column 9, lines 1-25, which specifically discloses that a good is distributed among level 2 and 3 stocking locations using a time elements. The entire system of Landvater is time phased, and, as discussed above, lead time and transit time are considered in the ordering process. Thus, Landvater looks at the levels of the supply chaib the item must pass through).

In response to argument (5), Examiner respectfully disagrees. Claim 37 recites "allocating delivery of the good after ordering from a supplier". Landvater does discuss the process of the good being delivered from the suppliers to the retailers, such as with respect to timing. See figure 1, column 6, lines 45-67, column 8, lines 25-45, column 9, lines 1-25 and 55-67, column 13, lines 30-45 and 59-67, column 14, lines 25-65, all of which talk about acquiring a product from a supplier after the product has been ordered. This includes lead time considerations. If something more specific is meant, it should be clearly recited in the claims to be given appropriate patentable weight.

In response to argument (6), Examiner respectfully disagrees. Examiner first points out that claims 41-46 are currently amended and are subject to the 35 USC 112, second paragraph, rejections set forth above as well as new 35 USC 103 rejections based on the amendments.

Landvater discusses the amount of goods needs to create and maintain the presentation required by the retail store(s). Landvater considers all of the following: what is projected to be sold, what is projected to be shipped, stock levels based on current and future arrangement of products in displays, required safety stock levels, etc. See column 8, lines 25-45, column 10, lines 1-20, column 14, lines 25-65, column 15, lines 1-6 and 17-25. Thus, the standard, regular

(i.e. average) presentation quantity for the location during the predetermined selling period is considered in the replenishment calculations by considering the required products for the display (based on shelf configurations stored the database) and the required safety stock. The system plans for the current presentation quantity needed to set up the display (and thus is also what is needed on the first day of selling the good). See also column 3, lines 10-25. Again, as per claim 43, the presentation quantity used for replenishment planning is the quantity needed for display setup and sales and thus is the total number that needs to be on hand when the good is received at the selling location. The goods have set presentation quantities in the system that are required (as well as required safety stock levels), and thus when combined to plan replenishments, this value is the largest quantity associated with the good. As per claim 45, Landvater discusses that projected demand is considered when planning replenishment quantities. Thus, projected demand is considered against the presentation quantities and requisite safety stock. Finally, Landvater teaches wherein the presentation quantity used in the roll up is the presentation quantity for the selling location on the last day of the predetermined selling period. Future changes in presentation are considered based on the future date that the change occurs. This "change date" is considered in the system, and thus the last day when the current configuration quantity is needed is also known. Based on the current 35 USC 112, second paragraph rejections, these are not necessarily six separate approaches, but rather related approaches to accomplishing the end task.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Beth Van Doren whose telephone number is 571-272-6737. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on 571-272-6729. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

bvd
bvd
April 23, 2007

Beth Van Doren
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3623